

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application.

I. ALLOWED CLAIMS

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-5 and 7 are allowable.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not describe “impulse-type drive.” The Examiner asserts that Figs. 12A and 12B do not give enough information. In the Response filed on August 12, 2005, Applicant asserted that the term “impulse-type drive” is well known and that one skilled in the art would understand this term. However, the Examiner requested that Applicant provide evidence that the term “impulse-type drive” is well known in the art.

As requested by the Examiner, Applicant submits herewith a copy of Japanese Unexamined Patent Publication No. JP 2000-221469, which shows that the term “impulse-type drive” is well known in the art. Specifically, paragraphs [0002] to [0004] discuss two (2) references: (1) Display Method and Picture Quality in Displaying Moving Picture in Holding Type of Display” and (2) “Improving the Moving Image Quality of TFT-LCDs” that show that the term “impulse-type drive”

are well known in the art. An English translation of paragraphs [0002] to [0004] of JP 2000-221469 also is submitted herewith. Therefore, Applicant submits that the term “impulse-type drive” is well known and that one skilled in the art would understand this term. Thus, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is improper and respectfully request that it be withdrawn.

### III. FORMAL DRAWINGS

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Office Action indicates that the drawings filed on September 22, 2000 have been approved.

### IV. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

#### A. Claims 1 and 8-12

Claims 1 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,094,216 (Taniguchi). This rejection is traversed.

This rejection is substantially similar to the rejection of claims 1, 6, and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) presented in the office action dated May 3, 2005. In response to Applicant’s argument presented in the Response filed on August 12, 2005 that Taniguchi does not teach “shutting off images displayed between continuous frames,” the Examiner asserts: “in between two consecutive frames as shown in Figs. 2A and 2B, [the] image is being forced to shut off due to a vertical blanking period and other periods

alternatively Ri and Li, and image is turned on in other periods (see col. 12, lines 54-65, and also col. 14, lines 53-62).”

Applicant submits that Taniguchi does not teach or suggest to shut off images displayed in intervals between continuous frames so as to carry out substantial impulse-type drive, as illustrated in Figs. 2A – 2D of the present application, and as recited by claim 1. Rather, Taniguchi teaches that the light intercepting portion intercepts a left-eye parallax image with respect to the right eye of the observer and a right-eye parallax image with respect to the right eye of the observer. The light transmitting portion and the light intercepting portion are replaced with each other in synchronization with display of replacing the right eye parallax image and the left-eye parallax image with each other. Applicant submits that this is not substantial impulse-type drive, as illustrated in Figs. 2A – 2D of the present application.

Therefore, because Taniguchi does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 8-12, the rejection of claims 1 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is improper.

#### B. Claims 6 and 13

Claims 6 and 13 again are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,427 (Faris). This rejection is traversed.

As presented above, Taniguchi does not teach or suggest to shut off images displayed in intervals between continuous frames so as to carry out substantial impulse-type drive, as recited by claim 1, on which claims 6 and 13 depend. Applicant submits that Faris fails to make up for this deficiency of Taniguchi. The Examiner does not assert that Faris teaches this feature of claim 1. Rather, the Examiner relies on Faris for the teaching of a flat panel display panel having direct and projection viewing modes of operation, and an electro-optical backlighting panel having a light emission state and a light transmission state.


Therefore, since the combination of Taniguchi and Faris fails to form the invention defined by claims 6 and 13, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper and respectfully requests that it be withdrawn.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any of the outstanding issues could be resolved through a telephone interview, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are due for the subject application. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 14, 2006  
Customer No.: 21874

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John J. Penny, Jr. (Reg. No. 36,984)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
Tel.: (617) 517-5549  
Fax: (617) 439-4170

534922